

Topological Mirrors and Quantum Rings

Cumrun Vafa¹

Lyman Laboratory of Physics

Harvard University

Cambridge, Ma 02138, USA

Aspects of duality and mirror symmetry in string theory are discussed. We emphasize, through examples, the importance of loop spaces for a deeper understanding of the geometrical origin of dualities in string theory. Moreover we show that mirror symmetry can be reformulated in very simple terms as the statement of equivalence of two classes of topological theories: Topological sigma models and topological Landau-Ginzburg models. Some suggestions are made for generalization of the notion of mirror symmetry.

¹ Talk presented at MSRI conference on Mirror Symmetry, March 1991, Berkeley.

1. Introduction

One of the most fascinating aspects of string theory is the way it modifies our intuition of classical geometry. It modifies it in ways which in some sense makes the classical geometry *more symmetrical*, and thus, in a sense simpler. This is probably most manifest in the principle of duality in string theory, which states that two classically inequivalent geometries (target spaces for strings) can nevertheless be identical from the string point of view. The aim of this paper is to develop this notion emphasizing the basic physical reasons for believing in its universal existence. My presentation is written with the mathematically oriented reader in mind and even though I will not be fully rigorous I hope that the main ideas are more or less clear to mathematicians.

I will first discuss some general aspects of Hilbert space of strings propagating in a target space in a geometrical way and discuss the notion of duality in this set up (section 2). Then I give some simple examples of this duality for bosonic strings (section 3). In section 4, I will discuss aspects of fermionic (super-) string vacua highlighting aspects which are relevant for mirror symmetries. As we will see an important ingredient in this setup is the notion of *quantum cohomology ring* of Kahler manifolds which is a deformation of the ordinary cohomology ring. In section 5 the relation between singularity theory and solutions of superstrings is discussed. This turns out to be a convenient bridge between target space interpretation and abstract conformal field theory definition of string theory. In section 6 the topological formulation of mirror symmetry is discussed. This turns out to be a very effective language to describe mirror symmetry. In this setup, mirror symmetry is stated as the equivalence of two seemingly inequivalent topological theories. This topological formulation has the advantage of simplifying the conformal theory to a much simpler theory which is the relevant piece needed for the discussion of mirror symmetry. Finally in section 7 I discuss some puzzles for mirror symmetry and their potential resolutions. I also discuss some potential generalizations of mirror symmetries and some possible connections with quantum groups and Donaldson theory.

2. String Hilbert space

In this section we discuss the basic structure of string vacua which involves the Hilbert space and operatorial formulation of the theory (this aspect is discussed much more extensively in the talks of Friedan in this conference; for a mathematical introduction see

[1]). Consider a closed string (one dimensional parametrized circle) sitting in a Riemannian manifold M . The space of all such configurations is given by the (parametrized) loop space of M which we denote by $\mathcal{LM}$. The geometrical questions that arise in string theory basically correspond to probing the geometry of $\mathcal{LM}$. The Hilbert space of *bosonic strings* is an ‘appropriate’ category of function space on $\mathcal{LM}$, which we denote by

$$\mathcal{H}_{bosonic} = \Phi(\mathcal{LM})$$

with norm inherited from the metric on M . The Hilbert space of *fermionic or superstrings* is the space of semi-infinite forms on $\mathcal{LM}$:

$$\mathcal{H}_{fermionic} = \Lambda^\infty(\mathcal{LM})$$

In addition to this Hilbert space, there is a more or less canonical one to one correspondence between the states $|v\rangle$ in the Hilbert space and some ‘special’ operators O_v acting on the Hilbert space. Roughly speaking, these operators are characterized by the fact that they are ‘invariant’ under reparametrizations of the string and that when they act on a special state $|0\rangle$ (the vacuum state) in the Hilbert space, they give the corresponding state ($O_v|0\rangle = |v\rangle$). These form a complete operator product algebra, in the sense that the product of any two of these operator is another such operator. Choosing a basis, we have

$$O_i O_j = \sum_k C_{ij}^k O_k$$

where the sum over k is generically an infinite sum.

A convenient method of computing C_{ij}^k is as follows: In string theory to find the amplitude of how a number of loops $l_i \in \mathcal{LM}$ ends up changing to the loops $\tilde{l}_j \in \mathcal{LM}$ we have to sum over all interpolating surfaces Σ immersed in M , $f(\Sigma) \subset M$ whose boundary is

$$\partial f((\Sigma)) = \bigoplus l_i - \bigoplus \tilde{l}_j$$

weighed by $\exp(-E)$ where E is the energy functional of the surface immersed in M (a natural extension of this applies to fermionic strings). We can choose a ‘basis’ for our Hilbert space of delta functions corresponding to fixed loops in the manifold. The above prescription then gives a way to compute the amplitude that two of these basis elements ends up with the third one. This can be extended to the full Hilbert space by multilinearity of the amplitude. The amplitude thus computed for the two string state $|i\rangle$ and

$|j\rangle$ to end up with the third one $|k\rangle$ can be obtained by integrating the ‘wave function’ of these states against the basic amplitude with the delta functions. The resulting answer is in fact the same as C_{ij}^k .

There are consistency conditions that Hilbert space and these coefficients need to satisfy for a consistent theory (following from the associativity of the operator products and modular invariance of string amplitudes). Once we are given such a structure, we can forget about M altogether and talk about the ‘string vacuum’, meaning this abstract Hilbert space with some canonical set of operators satisfying some ‘nice’ operator product properties. Let us denote such a structure by S and call it a *string vacuum*. Then two string vacua are equivalent, or isomorphic, if there is an isomorphism between the corresponding Hilbert spaces and the operators. Now it may happen that strings on two different manifolds M_1 and M_2 give rise to isomorphic string vacua

$$M_1 \neq M_2 \quad \text{but} \quad S(M_1) = S(M_2).$$

In other words *the map from manifolds to string vacua may be many to one*. In such a case we call the manifolds M_1 and M_2 *dual or mirror pairs*. Actually the choice of the terminology is unfortunate, as it may happen that more than two manifolds may give rise to the same string vacuum. One could also ask the reverse question: Does every string vacuum come from a manifold, i.e., is this map onto? The answer seems to be no (see for example [2]).

The existence of mirror symmetry is thus simply the statement of the existence of different geometrical ways to realize a string vacuum. We can use any representation we please. In such cases, if we try to study some aspects of the string vacuum we can choose any realization and may thus end up equating a ‘hard’ geometrical computation in one representation to an ‘easy’ one in another realization. In this lies the power of mirror symmetry transforming a hard problem to an easy one. In the next section we give some examples of mirror pairs in the context of bosonic strings.

3. Examples of Bosonic Mirrors

In this section we consider examples of mirror manifolds which lead to the same string vacuum for the bosonic strings. We will give two classes of examples: In one class the mirror Riemannian manifolds are topologically the same but geometrically distinct, and in the second class the mirror manifolds are even topologically distinct.

Let M_1 be the d dimensional torus identified (as a Riemannian manifold) with

$$M_1 = \frac{E^d}{\Gamma}$$

where Γ is a d dimensional discrete lattice group acting by isometry on flat Euclidean space E^d . Let us consider the Hilbert space of strings on M_1 which is related to the function space on $\mathcal{L}M_1$. First note that $\mathcal{L}M_1$ naturally splits to infinitely many components, corresponding to each element of Γ which can be identified with $H_1(M_1, \mathbb{Z})$. Moreover, the function space on each component splits to the functions of the center of strings which is isomorphic to ordinary function space on M_1 , and functions of oscillations of loops (which is universal and independent of Γ). The function space on M_1 is canonically isomorphic to Γ^* , the dual lattice to Γ using Fourier transform. So the dependence of Hilbert space of strings on Γ , appears as a choice of loop component (an element of Γ) and the Fourier component of functions of center of string (an element of Γ^*), i.e., the dependence comes through a choice of element of

$$\Gamma + \Gamma^*$$

This implies that if we consider the second manifold M_2

$$M_2 = \frac{E^d}{\Gamma^*}$$

Then the Hilbert spaces of strings based on M_1 and M_2 are isomorphic, both depending on the *self dual* lattice $\Gamma + \Gamma^*$. This turns out to extend to the full string vacuum structure, i.e., to the operators and their products. So M_1 and M_2 are mirror pairs. In physical terms this implies that there is no physical experiment one can do in string theory to distinguish strings on M_1 from strings on M_2 . This means in particular that the notion of ‘length’ is not a universally invariant way to decide if two manifolds are different as far as strings are concerned. This simple example illustrates the basic structure of duality or mirror symmetry in bosonic strings. This in fact was the first example of mirror symmetry discovered in string theory [3]. The rest of the examples are just extensions of this to more intricate cases.

For our second class of example we consider a simply laced compact Lie group G . Let H denote its Cartan torus. Consider an element $g \in G$ of finite order which belongs to the normalizer of H (i.e., it acts as a Weyl transformation on H). This means that

$$H \rightarrow gHg^{-1}$$

Let us denote the cyclic group generated by this transformation Λ_1 (we take g to act non-trivially on H). Choose an element $h \in H$ conjugate to $g \in G$. Consider the action

$$H \rightarrow h H$$

and denote the group action generated by this cyclic group Λ_2 . Consider taking the quotients of H by these two different group actions:

$$M_1 = \frac{H}{\Lambda_1} \quad M_2 = \frac{H}{\Lambda_2}$$

These two spaces are completely different. In fact M_1 is not even a manifold, but an orbifold, as g acts by fixed points on H , but M_2 is simply another torus, as h simply generates translations on H . It turns out that (bosonic) strings propagating on M_1 and M_2 are equivalent [4]. It is somewhat surprising that M_1 which is not even a manifold behaves very much like the smooth manifold M_2 as far as strings are concerned. This means, in the mathematical sense (as is also seen in examples for superstrings [4][5]) that loop space of an orbifold is a far better behaved object than the orbifold itself and in a sense provides a kind of universal space for resolution of orbifold singularity.

It should also be clear from the above examples that we can construct examples where three (or more) inequivalent Riemannian manifolds lead to the same string vacuum.

4. Superstring Vacua and Quantum Cohomology Rings

Most of our discussion up to now has been on bosonic strings. This is the case in which the Hilbert space is roughly speaking the function space on the loop space of manifold. However fermionic string is the physically (and mathematically) more interesting case. This is the case corresponding to the Hilbert space of semi-infinite forms on the loop space. In most applications one considers target spaces which are Kahler manifolds. In this case the Hilbert space and the operators acting on it naturally admit $Z \oplus Z$ grading, corresponding to the (holomorphic, anti-holomorphic) degree of the differential forms. Let $\mathcal{O}$ denote the space of physical operators. Then we have the decomposition according to the degrees of the forms:

$$\mathcal{O} = \bigoplus_{p,q \in Z} \mathcal{O}_{p,q}$$

Naturally under operator products the degrees add, as expected. Note that since we are dealing with semi-infinite differential forms, the degree of operators runs from $-\infty$ to

$+\infty$. This is an important difference with respect to the differential forms on the ordinary manifolds where the degree of differential forms is positive. As we shall see later this is one of the main reasons for the prediction of mirror symmetry in the fermionic strings. There is an anti-unitary involution which implies that $O_{p,q}$ is the conjugate of $O_{-p,-q}$. The existence of this anti-unitary involution is the statement of *CPT* invariance of the theory. In the language of forms, since we are dealing with semi-infinite forms, it is roughly the statement that operation of ‘adding’ and ‘subtracting’ forms are conjugate operations. This turns out to be an important piece of physics in the story of mirror symmetry.

Since the manifold M is naturally embedded in $\mathcal{LM}$, one expects that at least the differential forms on M are related to a subset of those on $\mathcal{LM}$ and in particular the cohomology ring of M should correspond to some closed operator algebra (modulo addition of cohomologically trivial elements) of operators acting on the fermionic Hilbert space. Let d denote the complex dimensions of M . Then we expect that there exist a special set of operators $A_\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_{p,q}$ with $0 \leq p, q \leq d$, such that the operator algebra of A_α correspond to the cohomology ring of M . This expectation turns out to be correct and we denote this subsector of the operators by $H^{*,*}$. In fact more is true [6]: There is a natural way to define the product of these operators which yields a closed truncated operator algebra when restricted to this special finite subspace of operators which becomes finite and related to the cohomology ring². There is one important subtlety however: Unlike the ordinary cohomology ring, the ring we get *depends* on the Kahler class of the metric on M . Only in the limit where we rescale the metric $g \rightarrow \lambda g$ and let $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ do the ring of A_α ’s become exactly the cohomology ring of M . The deviation from the classical result is due to instanton corrections [7] (an explicit exact result for instanton correction on Z orbifold is discussed in [8]). So string theory deforms the cohomology ring. A nice description of this deformation is as follows [9]. In order to describe this it is more convenient to go to the dual basis (i.e., homology). Let A^α denote the dual basis. Each α can be represented by a cycle in M . In order to specify the ring, it is sufficient to give the trilinear pairing between cycles. The ordinary ring is obtained by defining this pairing to be

$$\langle A^\alpha A^\beta A^\gamma \rangle = \#(C^\alpha \cap C^\beta \cap C^\gamma)$$

i.e., the number of common intersection points of the three cycles (and defining it to be zero if the common intersection has dimension bigger than zero). To define the ring we

² This is unlike the ordinary cohomology ring of manifold, in that the actual product of harmonic representatives does not form a closed operator algebra.

obtain in string theory we have to consider the space of holomorphic maps from CP^1 to the manifold M (rational curves in M), with the restriction that three fixed points on CP^1 get mapped to points in C^α, C^β and C^γ respectively. Again if the dimension of moduli of such maps is positive they do not contribute to the cohomology ring. The isolated ones contribute weighed by the instanton action. Let us denote an element of the space of such holomorphic maps by $h^{\alpha\beta\gamma}$. Let U denote the image of the sphere under h . Let k denote the Kahler form on M . Then the definition of the deformed ring (which is commutative and associative as shown in [9]) is

$$\langle A^\alpha A^\beta A^\gamma \rangle = \sum_{h^{\alpha\beta\gamma}} \#(C^\alpha \cap U) \cdot \#(C^\beta \cap U) \cdot \#(C^\gamma \cap U) \exp - \int h^{*\alpha\beta\gamma}(k) \quad (4.1)$$

Note that in the limit $k \rightarrow \infty$ only the constant holomorphic maps survive in this sum and that gives back the ordinary definition of intersection between cycles. So in this way we have a *quantum deformed* cohomology ring. To actually derive (4.1) in the context of string theory (and define it properly for multiple covers of holomorphic maps)³ is achieved by showing the topological nature of computation (and showing that on the cylinder it can be rephrased as a computation in a topological sigma model [9] which is discussed briefly in section 6). Without going to much detail let me at least indicate why its form is reasonable from what we have discussed up to this point. As we have discussed before to compute the algebra of operators in string theory we have to consider maps of a sphere with three discs cut out, to the manifold with three fixed boundary circles mapped to specific loops on the manifold. For constant loops or loops which are ‘close’ to being constant, we can take the limit in which the discs shrink to points, and map a specific point on CP^1 to a particular point on the manifold. Now the string loop amplitude computation tells us that we have to sum over all such loops weighed with e^{-E} , which in this case is nothing but the exponential of the pull back of the Kahler form on the map, as it appears in (4.1). The factors in front of exponential simply counts how many inequivalent ways a fixed rational curve could map to the three cycles (which is accomplished by an $SL(2, C)$ transformation of CP^1 to move the three points on the sphere). The fact that we sum over only holomorphic maps in (4.1) and get an exact answer and its precise definition can be best understood in the topological description of sigma models [9].

It is quite natural to speculate that this deformed ring may be the actual cohomology ring on a properly defined loop space. One way this may be realized is to consider the

³ Recent progress from this viewpoint has been made in [10].

space of holomorphic maps from the disc to the manifold. The map from the boundary of the disc to the manifold induced from such maps may be viewed as a ‘modified’ loop space. In this loop space the points of the manifold will be represented more than once in the loop space; in fact if we look for the space of constant loops which was previously isomorphic to the manifold, that would be the same as looking for holomorphic maps which take the boundary of the disc to a point, which is basically a holomorphic map from the sphere to the manifold. So in this case the manifold and all the holomorphic curves in it are representing the original manifold in this loop space. In this set up it is likely to expect that there exists a fixed point formula for the cohomology elements (corresponding to the circle action on the loop) which reduces the computation of cohomology elements to the fixed point subspace which consists of the manifold and the holomorphic curves in it. This would then (presumably) give rise to the cohomology ring defined in (4.1) with $k = 0$. We can then expect to get the deformed ring by twisting the cohomology ring, which allows us to weigh the different fixed points (i.e., different holomorphic maps) differently, and thus obtain the formula (4.1) with $k \neq 0$. This line of thought is worth pursuing further and may lead to a better geometrical understanding of the loop space itself.

As an example, if one considers strings on CP^1 , if we denote by x the standard $(1, 1)$ cohomology element, the classical cohomology ring is generated by x with

$$x^2 = 0$$

Let $\beta = \exp - \int k$ integrated over the nontrivial 2-cycle. Then the quantum deformed cohomology ring can be computed from its definition given above and is generated by x but the relation is deformed to [9]

$$x^2 = \beta$$

This can be generalized to CP^n [11] with the result that the quantum cohomology ring is defined by

$$x^{n+1} = \beta$$

We will discuss the conjectured generalization of this to the Grassmanians in the next section (see also [11]).

Note that in the above examples the deformed or quantum cohomology ring does not respect the grading of differential forms (in physics terminology we say that the instantons have destroyed chiral fermion number conservation), but the amount of violation of grading

can be understood. The point is that the (formal) dimension of moduli space $\mathcal{M}$ of holomorphic maps h is given by

$$\dim \mathcal{M} = d + c_1(h)$$

where d is the dimension of manifold and $c_1(h)$ denotes the evaluation of the first chern class on the image of h . By the definition of quantum cohomology ring we see that the sum of dimensions of cohomology elements will have to be $d + c_1(h)$ in order to get a non-vanishing result, which means that we have a violation by $c_1(h)$. This explains the cohomology ring structure for CP^n discussed above (where $c_1 = n + 1$ for the fundamental cycle). Note the fundamental role played by Kahler manifolds where $c_1 = 0$, i.e., the Calabi-Yau manifolds. In this case there is no violation of the grading, and we indeed get a quantum cohomology ring which respects the cohomology grading. For Calabi-Yau manifolds of dimensions one and two (torus and $K3$), there are generically no holomorphic maps (this is due to the fact that if there were any there would be a three dimensional family of them by Mobius transformations, and so this would be in contradiction with the above formal dimension). So the first case of interest in terms of the deformation of cohomology rings is the case of Calabi-Yau 3-fold, which has also been the case of most interest for string theory⁴.

To obtain a ‘static’ solution to superstring theory, it turns out that the target Kahler manifold M should admit a Ricci-flat metric, i.e., by Yau’s theorem it should be a Calabi-Yau manifold⁵. In such a case the dimensions of $H^{d,0}(M)$ is one, and thus we have in our theory an operator corresponding to this element in $H^{d,0}$. This operator induces an

⁴ For manifolds which have $c_1 < 0$, by which I mean there are some two cycles where c_1 evaluates to a negative number, the underlying theory is not very well behaved (i.e., it is not asymptotically free) and it seems that similarly the quantum cohomology ring is somewhat ill defined (in the Landau-Ginzburg description to be mentioned in section 5 it corresponds to perturbing the action by non-renormalizable terms with charge greater than 1). So quantum cohomology rings make better sense for $c_1 \geq 0$. However it would be interesting to see, and there is some indication [12] that maybe the mirror map acts on the space of *all* Kahler manifolds (possibly non-compact) by flipping the sign of c_1 , which in particular sends a Calabi-Yau manifold to another Calabi-Yau manifold.

⁵ Physically we should not ignore other manifolds as is commonly done, since one can use them to construct interesting non-static solutions of string theory, of the type relevant for cosmology (see for example [13])

isomorphism on the space of operators by multiplication [6]. This is known as the spectral flow and gives the isomorphism

$$O_{p,q} \sim O_{p+d,q}$$

The fact that this is an isomorphism is related to the existence of the conjugate (or inverse) operator. In other words By conjugation *there must also exist conjugate operators* in $H^{-d,0}$. This operator induces a correspondence between operators:

$$O_{p,q} \sim O_{p-d,q}$$

(similar statements of course hold for conjugate sectors of the Hilbert space and amounts to shifting the anti-holomorphic degree by $-d$). This isomorphism in particular applies to the special operators operators $H^{p,q}$ with $0 \leq p, q \leq d$ which represent cohomology of M and thus suggests that there are also ‘special’ operators which we denote by $H^{p-d,q}$, by shifting the holomorphic degree by $-d$. These special operators have the following properties which follows by the above isomorphism:

$$\dim H^{0,0} = \dim H^{-d,0} = \dim H^{0,d} = \dim H^{-d,d} = 1$$

$$\dim H^{-p,q} = \dim H^{d-p,q} = h^{d-p,q}$$

where $h^{*,*}$ denote the hodge numbers of M . It looks as if the operators in $H^{-p,q}$ describe the cohomology of a d -dimensional manifold which has the same hodge diamond as M except that it is flipped. In fact from the structure of string vacuum [6] it follows that there is a closed operator ring among these states which is additive in terms of their $Z \oplus Z$ grading just as was the case for the operators $H^{p,q}$ with $0 \leq p, q \leq d$. Note that the correspondence between cohomology elements of $H^{-p,q}$ and $H^{d-p,q}$ do not respect the ring structure and is thus not an isomorphisms of these rings. So we learn that *for any Calabi-Yau manifold we find not one but two rings—only one of which is related to the deformed cohomology ring of the manifold*. This second ring we call the *complex ring* of the manifold as it will turn out to (generically) characterize the complex structure of the Calabi-Yau manifold⁶.

⁶ The complex ring can be viewed geometrically as the ring generated by wedging $H^q(\Lambda^p \Theta)$ where Θ represents the holomorphic tangent bundle [14]. That their dimension is related to that of $H^{d-p,q}$ can be easily inferred from the existence of a holomorphic d form for the Calabi-Yau case.

So far we have described the Hilbert space and operators corresponding to strings imbedded in a Calabi-Yau manifold M . But usually we are given not a Calabi-Yau manifold, but the string vacuum itself, i.e., a Hilbert space and a set of operators acting on it. Note that in the isomorphism class of string vacua, if we just relabel the labels of $O_{p,q}$ by $O_{-p,q}$ we have not changed the string vacuum, and we obtain an isomorphic vacuum. This involution of one of the gradings simply exchanges the two rings that we discussed above. In this abstract setting how do we decide which of these two rings are ‘preferred’ in the sense that it corresponds to the deformation of the cohomology ring of a manifold? Since these two rings are absolutely on the same footing as far as the string vacuum is concerned, i.e., that there is an isomorphic string vacuum which relabels the sign of one of the gradings, the only way to restore the impartiality is *to postulate that for every Calabi-Yau manifold M there is another manifold $\tilde{M}$, such that the string vacuum on either M or $\tilde{M}$ gives rise to both cohomology rings*. This in particular means that

$$h^{p,q}(\tilde{M}) = h^{d-p,q}(M) \quad (4.2)$$

This is the basic idea of mirror symmetry [15] [6]. Note that this idea applies to a Calabi-Yau manifold of any dimension (not just three as is mostly applied to). Also note that the dimension of complex deformations of M which is equal to $h^{1,d-1}(M)$ is equal to the dimension of Kahler deformations of $\tilde{M}$ and vice versa. So under this mirror symmetry the shape and size of the manifolds get exchanged. Since the quantum cohomology ring encodes the information about the Kahler class in it, and under mirror symmetry shape and size get exchanged, this explains why the second ring, the complex ring, is characterizing the complex structure of the manifold.

Let us consider the simplest examples of mirror pairs: As we have discussed before for bosonic strings, strings propagating on a torus and the dual torus give identical vacua and form mirror pairs. It turns out that these are in fact also the simplest examples of mirror vacua for fermionic strings. Let us explain this briefly in the context of simplest complex torus, a one dimensional complex torus which is geometrically the product of two circles with radii R_1 and R_2 . Then the complex structure τ of the torus and its volume $-i\rho$ are given by

$$\tau = i \frac{R_1}{R_2} \quad \rho = i R_1 R_2$$

Now we apply the duality described in section 2 for bosonic strings in the case of target space being a torus. This duality works equally well for bosonic and fermionic strings.

Let us apply that to the second circle of this example sending $R_2 \rightarrow 1/R_2$ and we thus end up exchanging $\rho \leftrightarrow \tau$. This is an example of the general phenomena described above namely that the moduli controlling the shape and the size of the Calabi-Yau manifolds are exchanged under such a duality⁷. This is the simplest example of mirror symmetry. It is worth emphasizing that the other beautiful examples that have been found are highly non-trivial to describe geometrically [16] [17] [18] and have far more out reaching consequences. Nevertheless the basic idea remains the same, and fits very naturally into the general framework of duality just as we saw for the bosonic strings.

5. Catastrophes and Superstring Vacua

In this section we describe a link between string vacua and catastrophe theory. The origin of this direction of study of strings was motivated by trying to ignore geometry of target space and classify all string vacua directly (as had been emphasized by Friedan). So far we have mostly described string vacua arising from strings propagating in some target space. However, there are other useful ways to describe string vacua which may or may not be related to such a picture. The main idea is to note that the string amplitude was defined as a sum over all interpolating Riemann surfaces weighed by energy functional $\exp(-E)$. Here $E = \int |Dx|^2$ where x denotes the map which defines an immersion of the Riemann surface into the target space (with appropriate addition of fermionic terms in the case of superstrings). The basic idea to generalize this is to think of E as a functional of some fields (functions) defined on the Riemann surface. This defines a quantum field theory in two dimensions. There are many interesting examples of such field theories, but we will mention the one most relevant for superstring vacua which is the case of Landau-Ginzburg theories. Without going to too much detail it turns out that in this case the field theory is characterized by a single holomorphic function $W(x_i)$ where x_i are superfields. It was found [19] that quasi-homogeneous W 's which have an isolated critical point at $x_i = 0$ give rise to a nice class of (super conformal) theories. In this way the classification of quasihomogeneous singularities became very relevant for the classification of string vacua.

⁷ This duality extends to the full moduli of the torus not just to the case that it is geometrically the product of two circles. In the more general case the size also is a complex modulus due to the appearance of the anti-symmetric tensor fields which effectively complexifies the Kahler cone.

Moreover, it was found [20] that if the index of the singularity⁸ is integral and equal to the number of variables x_i minus 2, they are related to string vacua propagating on the Calabi-Yau ‘manifold’ defined by (the possibly singular variety) $W(x_i) = 0$ in weighted projective space with a very particular Kahler metric. This clarified the geometrical meaning of the important discovery of Gepner [21] in his construction of string vacua. Note that the complex structure of the Calabi Yau is fixed by $W = 0$, but the Kahler structure of Calabi-Yau is only implicitly specified by W (through its quantum symmetries) [22][20]. As an example if we take

$$W = x^4 + y^4 + z^2 + a x^2 y^2$$

Setting $W = 0$ in weighted projective two space, we get a one dimensional torus whose moduli is fixed by a . The volume of the torus is implicitly fixed (by the existence of quantum Z_4 symmetry) which teaches us that the volume of this torus is 1 for all a (and the anti-symmetric field vanishes) [22]. So in this way the study of strings propagating on Calabi-Yau manifolds can be very effectively studied using this picture, and this has become an important tool in the recent discovery of interesting class of examples of mirror symmetric pairs of string vacua.

For strings on Calabi-Yau manifolds, as we discussed before we automatically get two rings, only one of which is the cohomology ring of the manifold. What is the other, the complex ring, geometrically? Well, a *subring* of this second ring can be described geometrically, when the Calabi-Yau theory is represented by a variety defined by $W = 0$ in a weighted projective space. In this case if we consider the (integral dimension) ring of the singularity defined by

$$\mathcal{R} = \frac{C[x_i]}{dW} \tag{5.1}$$

they generate a subring of $H^{-p,p}$ discussed before (where p corresponds to the degree of the ring element). It would be interesting to see if one can extend this picture to the full ring for all $H^{-p,q}$ (and not just the diagonal elements). Note that this ring certainly does depend on the complex moduli of Calabi-Yau manifold (as that changes as we change W). This is consistent with the mirror picture, namely the mirror ring depends on Kahler moduli (as the quantum deformed cohomology ring does depend on Kahler moduli).

⁸ For a quasihomogenous function the index is defined as follows: By assigning degree one to a quasi-homogeneous W we can obtain fractional weights q_i of variables x_i . The index of W is simply $\sum(1 - 2q_i)$.

So can we describe the quantum deformed cohomology ring of some manifolds using singularity ring for some W ? The answer to this question should be in the affirmative if the mirror picture is valid. After all the mirror map changes $H^{-p,p} \rightarrow H^{p,p}$ and so maps (part of) the singularity ring to the diagonal elements of the deformed cohomology ring. The computation of cohomology ring for Calabi-Yau manifolds is in general rather difficult. So in this way we map a difficult problem (computation of deformed cohomology ring) to a simple problem (computation of the ring of a singularity) once we know the right transformation.

The quantum cohomology rings are easy to compute in some cases, as we mentioned before. For example for CP^n we mentioned that the deformed cohomology ring is

$$x^{n+1} = \beta$$

This of course can be written in the ‘mirror’ picture by the ring of W according to (5.1):

$$W(x) = \frac{x^{n+2}}{n+2} - \beta x$$

This can also be generalized to Grassmanians⁹. As discussed before for the case where $c_1 \neq 0$ we expect to violate the grading of the ring, which means the corresponding W would not be quasi-homogeneous. For Calabi-Yau manifolds as we mentioned before the grading of the ring is respected by the deformation, so if the deformed ring is that of a singularity ring the corresponding W will again be quasi-homogeneous.

6. Topological Mirrors

So far we have talked about mirror symmetry in the following sense: We have strings propagating on two manifolds M_1 and M_2 , which lead, as described before, to two Hilbert spaces each equipped with an infinite set of operators acting on them. Then if these two structures, or vacua, are isomorphic, we call M_1 and M_2 mirror pairs. Establishing this

⁹ The cohomology ring of Grassmanian $U(n+k)/U(n) \times U(k)$ can be written as the singularity ring [6] generated by a single potential $W(x_i) = \sum z_i^{n+k+1}/n+k+1$ where x_i are symmetric polynomials of degree i in z_j (with no monomial appearing more than once) and i runs from 1 to n . The x_i correspond to the chern classes of the n -dimensional tautological vector bundle on the Grassmanians. The quantum deformation of this ring is naturally conjectured to be $W \rightarrow W - \beta x_1$. The motivation for this comes from the fact that $c_1 = n+k$.

isomorphism at the level of Hilbert spaces is in general a complicated task. It would have been nice if there were a simple criterion to establish their equivalence. This question is also the same as asking how do we find a simple way to classify string vacua.

Classifying string vacua (and in particular static solutions which correspond to conformal field theories in two dimensions) has been investigated intensively in the past seven years. We are unfortunately still far from a complete classification. However for the fermionic vacua, an interesting class of vacua have, as discussed before, a simple description in terms of quasi-homogeneous singularities. In fact it is believed that for any quasi-homogeneous function W there is a unique string vacuum. In other words it is believed that the information about W is enough to reconstruct the full Hilbert space of strings and operators acting on it. More generally, whether or not the theory comes from a quasi-homogeneous singularity, it is believed that essentially given the chiral rings in the theory one has enough information to reconstruct the full theory. Applied to the special case of strings propagating on manifolds this may sound a little strange: We seem to be saying that given the cohomology ring of a manifold, we can find the manifold, which is certainly false. However it is for the special case of Calabi-Yau manifolds that we are considering this and in such cases just specifying the hodge numbers may go a long way in determining the manifold itself. Moreover we have *two* rings the *quantum cohomology ring* and the *complex ring*, which fix the Kahler class and the complex structure of the manifold respectively. Thus from Yau's proof of Calabi's conjecture which shows that knowing the Kahler class uniquely fixes the Ricci flat metric we can reconstruct the metric on the manifold by the information encoded in these rings.

Having said all these, it becomes clear that the phenomena of mirror symmetry can be formulated more compactly by stating that the two rings we get for one manifold are exchanged in the mirror manifold. In other words we can forget about the rest of the structure of string vacua and Hilbert spaces and the full set of operators acting on them and concentrate simply on this finite dimensional subset of special operators. In fact this concept can be formalized. Consider strings propagating on a Kahler manifold. It turns out there is a *twisted* or *topological* version of this theory [9][23] which can be obtained by a simple modification of the definition of the theory (by shifting the spin of fermions) which has the effect that the only physical operators we obtain are the ones corresponding to the cohomology classes and that they form the quantum cohomology ring of the manifold. If in addition the manifold in question is a Calabi-Yau manifold this twisting can be done in two

inequivalent ways (by shifting the spins of fermions chirally, which is allowed for Calabi-Yau manifolds because of absence of sigma model anomalies since $c_1(M) = 0$), one of which gives the quantum cohomology ring and the other gives the complex ring, which (except for the diagonal elements) has a less clear geometrical meaning. In this way we can get both rings depending on which twist we choose. However, it is clear that in this topological description the ordinary cohomology ring has a more ‘natural’ origin, and it seems to be ‘preferred’. However, there is another way to describe (fermionic) string vacua and that is via a Landau-Ginzburg theory. In this case we can also twist the theory and obtain a topological version [24] whose only (physical) operators correspond to the singularity ring of W . Again, if W is quasi-homogeneous, this can be done in two different ways, one of which corresponds to the singularity ring which when W describes a Calabi-Yau manifold correspond to its complex ring, and the other which has a less clear geometrical meaning (as it appears in the twisted sectors) correspond to the deformed cohomology ring. So we see that again we have two rings, but the complex ring is ‘preferred’.

The notion of mirror symmetry can be simply translated to the *equivalence of a topological sigma model with a topological Landau-Ginzburg model*, where the ‘preferred’ ring of the sigma model (the quantum cohomology ring or Kahler ring) gets mapped to the ‘preferred’ ring of the Landau-Ginzburg model (the singularity ring or complex ring). Stated in this way this mirror symmetry is more general than Calabi-Yau manifolds, as the W may or may not correspond to a Calabi-Yau manifold (even if it is quasi-homogeneous (see next section)). Also W may not be quasi-homogeneous as the example of the Grassmannians mentioned before illustrates (i.e., it goes beyond conformal theories) but nevertheless we have a mirror symmetry in the sense defined above.

7. Some Puzzles and Conclusion

It would be nice to be able to state the mirror symmetry in full generality. In geometrical terms, in the sense that strings on manifold M_1 behave the same way as strings on manifold M_2 this would be rather difficult to do. It is difficult even to fix precisely which category of geometrical objects we are considering. If we fix the category to be that of Calabi-Yau manifolds this would be false because there are examples of Calabi-Yau manifolds which are rigid (i.e., do not admit complex deformations) therefore their mirror would not admit Kahler deformations (i.e., $h^{1,1} = 0$), which means that the mirror would not even be a Kahler manifold! So in this sense we have lost the mirror. However in the

sense of equivalence of two topological theories, i.e., equivalence of a topological theory based on a sigma model and that on a Landau-Ginzburg model this may still be possible. In fact now we will give an example where this is indeed what happens. Consider a three-fold Calabi-Yau manifold defined by taking the product of three two dimensional tori, with Z_3 symmetry, and modding out by a $Z_3 \times Z_3$ symmetry generated by the elements $(\omega, \omega^{-1}, 1), (1, \omega, \omega^{-1})$ acting on the three tori, where ω denotes the Z_3 action. It is possible to resolve the fixed point singularities and obtain a smooth Calabi-Yau manifold. This manifold is rigid, in that it does not admit any complex deformations $h^{1,2} = 0$. The dimension of Kahler deformations is $h^{1,1} = 84$. What is the mirror for this manifold? The answer turns out to be easy in this case: It is the Landau-Ginzburg theory defined by

$$W = \sum_{i=1,\dots,9} x_i^3 + \sum_{i \neq j \neq k} a_{ijk} x_i x_j x_k$$

The way we know this is that at $a_{ijk} = 0$ we can explicitly construct the Landau-Ginzburg theory and compare it explicitly with the geometrical description which also turns out to be exactly solvable (before blowing up the singularities) and one finds that (with the metric and the antisymmetric field of tori corresponding to the point of enhanced Z_3 symmetry) they agree. Moreover one can map the fields $x_i x_j x_k$ to the Kahler classes of the manifold. So in this way the 84 Kahler deformations of the manifold (which includes the blow up modes) will get mapped to the deformation of W which are captured through varying a_{ijk} above. This description of mirror symmetry is enough to capture the counting of instantons on the original manifold by studying variations of Hodge structure characterized by W [14] so for the purposes of ‘simplifying’ the instanton counting it works as well. So in a sense we do not really need a geometrical mirror; or if we insist we can say that the geometrical mirror in this case is a 7 fold defined by $W = 0$ in CP^8 . But this description is only valid as far as we are relating the variation of its Hodge structure with the deformed cohomology ring of the original Calabi-Yau manifold¹⁰. This example reinforces another view of mirror symmetry, namely, the abstract property of the rings that may arise in conformal theory is the same whether or not they come from the cohomology ring or the

¹⁰ It would be interesting to see if turning on (possibly singular) dilaton fields and torsion on this 7-fold, gives a sigma model which is equivalent to the three fold Calabi-Yau we started with. As is well known turning on dilaton field shifts the effective dimension (central charge) of the theory. In such a picture the freezing of Kahler degrees of freedom would be related to solving dilaton equations of motion.

complex ring. So somehow the lesson is to *forget* about the underlying manifold altogether and concentrate on abstract properties of the rings, and the classification of the kinds of rings that can appear. This is very much the question of classification of variation of Hodge structures[25]. This is in fact the point of view advocated by Cecotti [14]. In this setup the existence of mirror symmetry is probably related to the ‘scarcity’ of inequivalent types of variations of hodge structure (with some given topological invariants).

The same idea of mirror picture applies even to the general case of manifolds with $c_1 \neq 0$, for example the Grassmanians, where the ‘mirror symmetry’ allows us to compute exactly instanton corrections to the analog of ‘Weil-Petersson’ metric for such manifolds [26]. This follows from the structure of special geometry which exists even off criticality. This reinforces the picture that *we should not restrict our attention to Calabi-Yau manifolds if we are to have a deeper understanding of mirror symmetry.*

The notion of ‘quantum’ cohomology ring might remind one of seemingly unrelated subject of ‘quantum’ groups. As is well known these groups have representation ring which is a ‘quantum deformation’ of the classical representation ring of the group. The deformations being parametrized by a parameter k which is the level of quantum group, and as $k \rightarrow \infty$ we recover the classical representation ring. Indeed this k seems to play a very similar role to the role kahler class k plays in quantum cohomology ring in the infinite limit of which one recovers the classical cohomology ring. It turns out these two different ‘quantum rings’ are not as unrelated as might seem at first sight! In particular it has been shown [27] that for special class of such theories the fusion ring (representation ring) of quantum groups get mapped to the chiral ring of a Landau-Ginzburg theory (see also [28] [11]). For example, if one considers $SU(n)$ quantum group with level $k = 1$, its representation ring is isomorphic to the quantum cohomology ring of CP^{n-1} (discussed before). It would be interesting to see whether or not all the rings of quantum groups can be interpreted as the quantum cohomology ring of some manifold (for example which manifold has the quantum cohomolgy ring related to Chebychev polynomial?). This connection has become even more intriguing with the discovery [26] that precisely these Landau-Ginzburg theories seem integrable field theories in the sense that they have an integrable classical equation describing the generalized special geometry (some further evidence for their integrability has been found in [29]). It was further conjectured in [26] that whenever the ring of a supersymmetric theory corresponds to that of a RCFT (rational conformal field theories), i.e. a solution to quantum group representation ring, the corresponding

field theory is integrable. These connections we believe are very important to understand better for a more abstract understanding of ‘mirror symmetry’ and ‘quantum rings’.

We have learned that mirror symmetry is the statement of equivalence of two topological theories, one which is difficult to compute and the other which is easy. It is natural to continue this line of thinking and suggest that the same thing happens for other topological theories. In particular Donaldson theory which captures some invariants for differentiable manifolds in four dimensions, has a topological field theory description [30]. It is in general very difficult to compute Donaldson invariants, just as it is in general difficult to compute the number of rational (holomorphic) curves in a manifold. But we have seen in the latter case that there is a simpler topological theory which is the Landau-Ginzburg description. It is tempting to conjecture that there is a similar thing going to happen in four dimensions [31], namely that there must be a topological mirror theory, far simpler than Donaldson theory, which via an appropriate mirror map allows us to effectively compute Donaldson invariants. It remains to be seen if this conjecture is valid.

It is a pleasure to thank S. Cecotti for many discussions which has greatly influenced my thinking on this subject. I would like to thank D. Kazhdan for a careful reading of this manuscript and for making suggestions for its improvement. I also am thankful to I. Singer and S.-T. Yau for encouraging me to participate in this conference. This work was supported in part by the Packard Foundation and NSF grants PHY-89-57162 and PHY-87-14654.

References

- [1] G. Segal, *Conformal Field Theory*, Oxford preprint; and lecture at the IAMP Congress, Swansea, July, 1988.
- [2] K.S. Narain, M.H. Sarmadi and C. Vafa, Nucl. Phys. B288 (1987) 551;
J. Harvey, G. Moore and C. Vafa, Nucl. Phys B304 (1988) 269.
- [3] K. Kikkawa and M. Yamasaki, Phys. Lett. B149 (1984) 357;
N. Sakai and I. Senda, Prog. Theor. Phys. 75 (1984) 692.
- [4] L. Dixon, J. Harvey, C. Vafa and E. Witten, Nucl.Phys. B274 (1986) 285 ;
J. Lepowski, Proc. of the Nat. Acad. of Sci. 82 (1985) 8295.
- [5] S.S. Roan, Int. Jour. of Math., v.1 (1990) 211.
- [6] W. Lerche, C. Vafa and N. Warner, Nucl. Phys. B324 (1989) 427.
- [7] M. Dine, N. Seiberg, X.G. Wen and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B278 (1987) 769; B289 (1987) 319.
- [8] S. Hamidi and C. Vafa, Nucl. Phys. B279 (1987) 465;
L. Dixon, D. Friedan, E. Martinec and S. Shenker, Nucl. Phys. B282 (1987) 13.
- [9] E. Witten, Comm. Math. Phys. 118 (1988) 411; Nucl. Phys. B340 (1990) 281.
- [10] P.S. Aspinwall and D.R. Morrison, *Topological Field Theory and Rational Curves*, preprint, OUTP-91-32p, DUK-M-91-12.
- [11] K. Intriligator, *Fusion Residues*, Harvard preprint, HUTP-91/A041.
- [12] This idea arose in discussions with G. Horowitz.
- [13] A. Tseytlin and C. Vafa, preprint HUTP-91/A049; JHU-TIPAC-910028.
- [14] S. Cecotti, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A6 (1991) 1749;
S. Cecotti, Nucl. Phys. B355 (1991) 755.
- [15] L. Dixon, unpublished.
- [16] B.R. Greene and M.R. Plesser, Nucl. Phys. B338 (1990) 15
- [17] P. Candelas, X.C. de la Ossa, P.S. Green and L. Parkes, Nucl. Phys. B359 (1991) 21;
Phys. Lett. 258B (1991) 118;
P. Candelas, M. Lynker, and R. Schimmrigk, Nucl. Phys. B341 (1990) 383.
- [18] P.S. Aspinwall, C.A. Lutken, and G.G. Ross, Phys. Lett. 241B (1990) 373;
P.S. Aspinwall and C.A. Lutken, Nucl. Phys. B355 (1991) 482.
- [19] C. Vafa and N. Warner, Phys. Lett. B218 (1989) 51 ;
E. Martinec, Phys. Lett B217 (1989) 431.
- [20] B.R. Greene, C. Vafa and N. Warner, Nucl. Phys. B324 (1989) 371;
E. Martinec, *Criticality, Catastrophe and Compactifications*, V.G. Knizhnik memorial volume, 1989.
- [21] D. Gepner, Phys. Lett. 199B (1987) 380; Nucl. Phys. B296 (1987) 380.
- [22] C. Vafa, Mod. Phys. Lett. A4 (1989) 1615.
- [23] T. Eguchi and S.-K. Yang, Mod. Phys. Lett. A4 (1990) 1653.

- [24] C. Vafa, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A*6 (1991) 337.
- [25] P. Griffiths, *Variation of Hodge Structure*, in *Topics in Transcendental Algebraic Geometry*, Princeton University Press, Princeton 1984.
- [26] S. Cecotti and C. Vafa, *Topological Anti-Topological Fusion*, preprint HUTP-91/A031; SISSA-69/91/EP; and HUTP-91/A062 .
- [27] D. Gepner, *Fusion Rings and Geometry*, preprint, NSF-ITP-90-184.
- [28] M. Spiegelglas and S. Yankielowicz, in preparation;
M. Spiegelglas, *Setting Fusion rings in topological Landau-Ginzburg theories*, preprint, Technion-PH-8-91 (1991).
- [29] D. Nemeschansky and N.P. Warner, *Topological Matter, Integrable Models and Fusion Rings*, preprint USC-91/031.
- [30] E. Witten, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 117 (1988) 353.
- [31] S. Cecotti and C. Vafa, Work in progress.